Envy-Free Matchings with Lower Quotas

Yu Yokoi *

Abstract

While every instance of the Hospitals/Residents problem admits a stable matching, the problem with lower quotas (HR-LQ) has instances with no stable matching. For such an instance, we expect the existence of an envy-free matching, which is a relaxation of a stable matching preserving a kind of fairness property.

In this paper, we investigate the existence of an envy-free matching in several settings, in which hospitals have lower quotas and not all doctor-hospital pairs are acceptable. We first show that, for an HR-LQ instance, we can efficiently decide the existence of an envy-free matching. Then, we consider envy-freeness in the Classified Stable Matching model due to Huang (2010), i.e., each hospital has lower and upper quotas on subsets of doctors. We show that, for this model, deciding the existence of an envy-free matching is NP-hard in general, but solvable in polynomial time if quotas are paramodular.

arXiv:1704.04888v1 [cs.GT] 17 Apr 2017

1 introduction

Since the seminal work of Gale and Shapley [9], the *Hospitals/Residents problem* (HR, for short), or the *College Admission problem*, has been studied extensively [12, 20, 29]. They proposed an algorithm which finds a stable matching in linear time for every instance. In this problem, each hospital has an upper quota for the number of doctors assigned to it. In some applications, each hospital also has a lower quota for the number of doctors it receives. That is, we want to consider the Hospitals/Residents problem with lower quotas (HR-LQ, for short). Unfortunately, for HR-LQ, we cannot ensure the existence of a stable matching. However, it is easy to decide whether there is a stable matching or not for a given HR-LQ instance, since the number of doctors assigned to each hospital is identical for any stable matching (by the well-known Rural Hospitals Theorem [10, 26, 27, 28]).

When a given HR-LQ instance has no stable matching, one natural approach is to weaken stability concept preserving some kind of fairness. *Envy-freeness* [32] (also called *fairness* in the school choice literature [6, 11]) of matchings is a relaxation of stability obtained by giving up efficiency. Similarly to stability, envy-freeness forbids the existence of a doctor who has justified envy toward some other doctor, but it tolerates the existence of a doctor who claims a hospital's vacant seat. The importance of envy-freeness and its variants is recently recognized in the context of constrained matching [6, 11, 17, 18, 19], and structural properties of envy-free matchings are investigated in [32].

Envy-free matchings naturally arise when we find a matching in the following ad hoc way. For a HR-LQ instance, suppose that we find a stable matching disregarding lower quotas, and the obtained matching does not meet lower quotas. Let us reduce upper quotas of hospitals which receive much doctors, and again find a stable matching disregarding lower quotas, and repeat.

*National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo 101-8430, Japan. E-mail: yokoi@nii.ac.jp. Supported by JST CREST, Grant Number JPMJCR14D2, Japan.

If we find a stable matching which meets lower quotas after repeating such adjustments, then the obtained matching is an envy-free matching of the original instance (see Proposition 2.4).

Since an envy-free matching is a relaxation of a stable matching, it is more likely to exist. Indeed, if all doctor-hospital pairs are acceptable and the sum of lower quotas of all hospitals does not exceed the number of doctors, then we can ensure the existence of an envy-free matching. (This follows from the results of Fragiadakis et al. [6]). However, if not all pairs are acceptable, then even an envy-free matching may fail to exist. Moreover, deciding the existence of an envy-free matching is not so simple because envy-free matchings have different sizes unlike stable matchings.

Our Contribution In this paper, we study envy-free matchings of HR-LQ model and its generalizations. In our models, not all doctor-hospital pairs are acceptable (i.e., preference lists are incomplete).

We first investigate envy-free matchings in the setting of HR-LQ. We provide the following characterization of the existence of an envy-free matching. Let I be a given HR-LQ instance and let I' be an HR instance obtained from I by removing lower quotas and replacing upper quotas with the original lower quotas. We prove that, I has an envy-free matching if and only if every hospital is full in a stable matching of I' (Theorem 2.6). Combined with the rural hospitals theorem, this characterization yields an efficient algorithm to decide the existence of an envy-free matching of an HR-LQ instance. That is, we can decide it by finding a stable matching of the HR instance whose upper quotas are the original lower quotas, and checking whether all hospitals are full or not.

Next, we move to a generalized model, in which each hospital imposes an upper and a lower quota on each subset of doctors. That is, we consider an envy-free matching version of Huang's *Classified Stable Matching* [16] (CSM, for short). (See "Related Works" below for results on stable matchings of CSM and of its generalizations.) In his original model, each hospital has a family of sets of doctors, called *classes*, and each class has an upper and a lower quota. We formulate this setting by letting each hospital have a pair of set functions defined on the set of acceptable doctors. These two functions respectively represent upper quotas and lower quotas. For this model, we show that, it is NP-hard to decide the existence of an envy-free matching, even if the number of non-trivial quotas is linear (Theorem 2.6). The proof is by reduction from 3-SAT problem.

Then, we provide a tractable special case of CSM. We show that, if the pair of lower and upper quota function of each hospital is *paramodular* [7] (see Section 4 for the definition), then we can decide the existence of an envy-free matching in polynomial time. This means that, the problem is tractable if the family of acceptable doctor sets forms a generalized matroid for each hospital. A *generalized matroid* [30] (also called an $M^\natural$*-convex family* [23]) is a family of subsets satisfying a certain axiom called the exchange axiom. It is known that a paramodular function pair defines a generalized matroid and vice versa. Since constraints defined on a laminar (or, nested, or hierarchical) family yield a generalized matroid, our tractable special case includes the case in which each hospital defines quotas on a laminar family of doctors.

Related Works Recently, the study of matching models with lower quotas has developed substantially [1, 5, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21]. The Hospitals/Residents problem with lower quotas (HR-LQ) was first studied by Hamada et al. [13, 14], who considered the minimization of the number of blocking pairs subject to upper and lower quotas. They showed the NP-hardness of the problem, gave an inapproximability result, and provided an exponential-time exact al-

gorithm. Motivated by the matching scheme used in the higher education sector in Hungary, Biró et al. [2] considered a version of HR-LQ in which hospitals (i.e., colleges) are allowed to be closed, i.e., each hospital is assigned enough doctors or no doctor. They showed the NP-completeness to decide the existence of a stable matching.

The Classified Stable Matching problem (CSM), proposed by Huang [16], is a generalization of HR-LQ without hospital closures. In this model, each hospital (i.e., institute in his terminology) has a classification of doctors (i.e., applicants) based on their expertise and gives an upper and lower quota on each class. Huang showed that it is NP-complete in general to decide the existence of a stable matching, and also proved that it is solvable in polynomial time if classes form a laminar family. For this tractable special case, Fleiner and Kamiyama [5] gave a concise explanation in terms of matroids, and their framework is generalized by Yokoi [33] to a framework with generalized matroids.

To cope with the nonexistence of a stable matching in constrained matching models (not only models with lower quotas but also with other kinds of constrained such as regional constraints), several relaxations of stability have been proposed. See, e.g., Kamada and Kojima [17, 18], Fragiadakis et al. [6], and Goto et al. [11]. Envy-freeness is one of them which puts emphasis on fairness rather than efficiency. Fragiadakis et al. [6] provided a strategy-proof algorithm which always finds an envy-free matching (i.e., a fair matching, in their terminology) of HR-LQ under the assumption that all doctor-hospital pairs are acceptable. The outcome of their mechanism also fulfills a second-best efficiency (i.e., nonwastefulness) property. Their framework is generalized in Goto et al. [11], so that regional quotas can be handled.

Finally, we compare our models with some of above models. Unlike models of Goto et al. [11] and Kamada and Kojima [17, 18], our models cannot handle regional quotas. Instead, our CSM model (in Sections 3 and 4) allows each hospital to have quotas on classes of doctors. The setting of a tractable special case of CSM in Section 4 is equivalent to a many-to-one case of Yokoi's model [33], which studied stable matchings. Neither of the work [33] and this paper relies on results of the other, while both of them utilize the matroid framework of Fleiner [3, 4].

Organization The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 investigates envy-free matchings in Hospitals/Residents problem with lower quotas (HR-LQ). In Section 3, we define an envy-free matching in classified stable matching (CSM) model, and show the NP-hardness of its existence test. As its tractable special case, Section 4 presents results on CSM with paramodular quota functions. The proofs for statements in Section 4 are provided in Section 5.

2 Envy-freeness in HR with lower quotas

In this section, we investigate envy-free matchings in the Hospitals/Residents problem with lower quotas (HR-LQ).

There are two disjoint sets D and H, which represent doctors and hospitals, respectively. A set of acceptable doctor-hospital pair is denoted by $E \subseteq D \times H$. For each doctor $d \in D$, its acceptable hospital set is denoted by

$$A(d) := \{\, h \in H \mid (d,h) \in E \,\} \subseteq H,$$

and d has a preference list (strict order) $\succ_d$ on $A(d)$. Similarly, for each hospital $h \in H$,

$$A(h) := \{\, d \in D \mid (d,h) \in E \,\} \subseteq D,$$

and h has a preference $\succ_h$ on $A(h)$. Each hospital h has a lower quota $l_h \in \mathbf{Z}$ and an upper quota $u_h \in \mathbf{Z}$ with

$$0 \leq u_h \leq l_h \leq |A(h)|.$$

We call a tuple $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u_h)\}_{h \in H})$ an **HR-LQ instance**, where $\succ_{DH}$ is an abbreviated notation for the union of $\{\succ_d\}_{d \in D}$ and $\{\succ_h\}_{h \in H}$. In particular, if $l_h = 0$ for all $h \in H$, we call it an **HR instance**. An arbitrary subset M of E is called an **assignment**. For any assignment M, we denote $M(d) = \{\, h \in A(d) \mid (d, h) \in M \,\}$ for each $d \in D$ and $M(h) = \{\, d \in A(h) \mid (d, h) \in M \,\}$ for each $h \in H$. If $|M(d)| = 1$, the notation $M(d)$ is also used to refer its single element.

An assignment M is called a **matching** (or, said to be **feasible**) if $|M(d)| \leq 1$ for each $d \in D$ and $l_h \leq |M(h)| \leq u_h$ for each $h \in H$. In a matching M, a doctor d is **unassigned** (resp., **assigned**) if $M(d) = \emptyset$ (resp., $|M(d)| = 1$), and h is **undersubscribed** (resp., **full**) if $|M(h)| < u_h$ (resp., $|M(h)| = u_h$).

Definition 2.1. For a matching M, an unassigned pair $(d, h) \in E \setminus M$ is a **blocking pair** if (i) d is unassigned or $h \succ_d M(d)$, and (ii) h is undersubscribed or there is $d' \in M(h)$ with $d \succ_h d'$. A matching M is **stable** if there is no blocking pair.

For an HR instance, it is known that the algorithm of Gale and Shapley [9] always finds a stable matching and the set of stable matchings has the following property.

Proposition 2.2 (**"Rural Hospitals" Theorem** [10, 26, 28])**.** *For a given HR instance, any two stable matchings M, M' satisfy $|M(h)| = |M'(h)|$ for every $h \in H$. Moreover $M(h) = M'(h)$ if h is undersubscribed in M or M'.*

As mentioned in Introduction, if hospitals have lower quotas, then we cannot guarantee the existence of a stable matching anymore. By Proposition 2.2, however, we can easily check the existence by finding a stable matching disregarding lower quotas and checking whether the obtained matching meets lower quotas.

For an instance which has no stable matching, we want to obtain some matching which still has a kind of fairness. As a relaxation of the concept of stability, envy-freeness (also called fairness) of matchings has been proposed [6, 32].

Definition 2.3. For a matching M, a doctor d has **justified envy** toward d' with $M(d') = h$ if (i) d is unassigned or $h \succ_d M(d)$ and (ii) $d \succ_h d'$. A matching M is **envy-free** if no doctor has justified envy.

Note that, if d has justified envy toward d' with $M(d) = h$, then it means that (d, h) is a blocking pair. Thus, stability implies envy-freeness. The envy-freeness of a matching is also regarded as the stability with reduced upper quotas as follows.

Proposition 2.4. *For $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u_h)\}_{h \in H})$, an assignment M is an envy-free matching if and only if M is a stable matching of $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u'_h)\}_{h \in H})$ for some $\{u'_h\}_{h \in H}$ with $u'_h \leq u_h$ $(h \in H)$.*

Proof. The "if" part is clear since feasibility in I' implies that in I, and stability implies envy-freeness. For the "only if" part, suppose that M is envy-free in I and set $q'_h := |M(h)|$ for each $h \in H$. Then, M is feasible for I' and all hospitals are full, and hence there is no doctor who claims a hospital's vacant seat. As M is envy-free, then it is stable in I'. □

By Proposition 2.4, to check whether we can obtain a stable matching by reducing upper quotas, it suffices to check the existence of an envy-free matching.

Under the assumption that all doctor-hospital pairs are acceptable and the sum of lower quotas does not exceed the number of doctors, Fragiadakis et al. [6] provided a strategy-proof mechanism which always finds an envy-free matching. As a corollary, we have the following.

Proposition 2.5. *For an instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u_h)\}_{h\in H})$ such that $E = D \times H$ and $|D| \geq \sum_{h\in H} l_h$, there exists an envy-free matching.*

However, if not all pairs are acceptable, then even an envy-free matching may not exist. Figure 1 shows an instance with $D = \{d_1, d_2\}$, $H = \{h_1, h_2\}$, $E = \{(d_1, h_1), (d_2, h_1), (d_2, h_2)\}$, $l_{h_1} = l_{h_2} = 1$, and $u_{h_1} = u_{h_2} = 2$. For this instance, $M = \{(d_1, h_1), (d_2, h_2)\}$ is the unique feasible matching, but it is not envy-free since d_2 has justified envy toward d_1. Hence, there is no envy-free matching.

Doctor's preferences	Hospitals' preferences
$d_1 : h_1$	$h_1 : 1 : 2 : d_2 \;\; d_1$
$d_2 : h_1 \;\; h_2$	$h_2 : 1 : 2 : d_2$

Figure 1: An instance of HR-LQ with no envy-free matching

Note that an envy-free matching does exists if there is no lower quota, since empty matching is clearly envy-free. Therefore, the existence test of an envy-free matching is non-trivial when incomplete lists and lower quotas are introduced simultaneously. Here we provide a characterization.

Theorem 2.6. *An HR-LQ instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u_h)\}_{h\in H})$ has an envy-free matching if and only if some stable matching M' of the HR instance $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(0, l_h)\}_{h\in H})$ satisfies $|M'(h)| = l_h$ for all $h \in H$.*

Proof. For the "if" part, let M' be a stable matching of I' satisfying $|M'(h)| = l_h$ for all $h \in H$. Then, M' is feasible for I' and no doctor has justified envy since M' has no blocking pair. Thus, M' is an envy-free matching of I.

For the "only if" part, assume that I has an envy-free matching M. Suppose, to the contrary, a stable matching M' of I' satisfies $|M'(h^*)| < l_{h^*}$ for some $h^* \in H$. Let us denote $N = M \setminus M'$ and $N' = M' \setminus M$. For every $h \in H$, since $|M'(h)| \leq l_h \leq |M(h)|$, we have $|N'(h)| \leq |N(h)|$. In particular, $|N'(h^*)| < |N(h^*)|$ follows from $|M'(h^*)| < l_{h^*}$.

Consider a bipartite graph $G = (D, H; N \cup N')$, i.e., a graph between doctors and hospitals with edge set $N \cup N' = M \triangle M'$. Let G^* be a connected component of G including h^*, and denote by D^* and H^* the sets of doctors and hospitals in G^*, respectively. Since there is no edge connecting G^* and outside, $\sum_{d\in D^*} |N(h)| = \sum_{h\in H^*} |N(h)|$ and $\sum_{d\in D^*} |N'(h)| = \sum_{h\in H^*} |N'(h)|$. As $|N'(h^*)| < |N(h^*)|$ and $|N'(h)| \leq |N(h)|$ for any $h \in H^*$, we obtain

$$\sum_{d\in D^*} |N'(h)| = \sum_{h\in H^*} |N'(h)| < \sum_{h\in H^*} |N(h)| = \sum_{d\in D^*} |N(h)|.$$

Then, there exists $d^* \in D^*$ with $|N'(d^*)| < |N(d^*)|$, which implies $N'(d^*) = \emptyset$ and $|N(d^*)| = 1$ since $N' = M' \setminus M$ and $N = M \setminus M'$ are subsets of matchings. As G^* is a connected bipartite graph, there is a path $d_0\, h_0\, d_1\, h_1 \ldots d_k\, h_k$ with $d_0 = d^*$ and $h_k = h^*$. Also, as $|N(d_i)| \leq 1$ and

$|N'(d_i)| \leq 1$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots k$, this path alternately uses edges in $N = M \setminus M'$ and $N' = M' \setminus M$. Since $N'(d^*) = \emptyset$ and $|N(d^*)| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &M'(d_0) = \emptyset, \\ &(d_i, h_i) \in M \setminus M' \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, k), \\ &(d_{i+1}, h_i) \in M' \setminus M \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1). \end{aligned}$$

The doctor d_0 is unassigned in M' and finds h_0 acceptable because $(d_0, h_0) \in M$. Hence, the stability of M' implies that h_0 prefers $d_1 \in M'(h_0)$ to d_0. Then, the envy-freeness of M implies that d_1 prefers $h_1 = M(d_1)$ to h_0. In this way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &d_{i+1} \succ_{h_i} d_i \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1), \\ &h_{i+1} \succ_{d_{i+1}} h_i \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $M(d_k) = h_k \succ_{d_k} h_{k-1} = M'(d_k)$. Since $h_k = h^*$ satisfies $|M'(h_k)| < l_{h_k}$, then (d_k, h_k) is a blocking pair in I', which contradicts the stability of M'. □

Theorem 2.6 ensures that the following algorithm decides the existence of an envy-free matching of an HR-LQ instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u_h)\}_{h \in H})$.

Algorithm EF-HR-LQ

Step1. Find a stable matching M' of $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(0, l_h)\}_{h \in H})$.

Step2. If $|M'(h)| = l_h$ for all $h \in H$, then return M'. Otherwise, return "there is no envy-free matching."

Since the Gale-Shapley algorithm finds a stable matching of an HR instance in $O(|E|)$ time, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2.7. *For any HR-LQ instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(l_h, u_h)\}_{h \in H})$, the algorithm* EF-HR-LQ *decides whether I has an envy-free matching or not in $O(|E|)$ time.*

3 Envy-freeness in Classified Stable Matching

In this section, we consider the envy-freeness in a model in which each hospital has lower and upper quotas on subsets of doctors. This can be regarded as an envy-free matching version of the Classified Stable Matching, proposed by Huang [16]. Similarly to Section 2, we have doctors D, hospitals H, acceptable pairs $E \subseteq D \times H$, and preferences $\succ_{DH}$.

The only deference from HR-LQ is that, in the current model, each hospital $h \in H$ has a pair of functions $p_h, q_h : 2^{A(h)} \to \mathbf{Z}$, instead of a pair of numbers l_h, u_h. These functions define a lower and an upper quota for each subset of acceptable doctors. Through this paper, we assume that for any hospital h, the functions p_h and q_h satisfy

$$0 \leq p_h(B) \leq q_h(B) \leq |B| \qquad (B \subseteq A(h))$$

We call such a tuple $(D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$ a **CSM instance**. For each $h \in H$, the family of **acceptable** subsets of doctors is denoted by

$$\mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h) := \{\, X \subseteq A(h) \mid \forall B \subseteq A(h) : p_h(B) \leq |X \cap B| \leq q_h(B) \,\}.$$

For any $h \in H$, we say that $B \subseteq A(h)$ has a **non-trivial lower** (resp., **upper**) **constraint** if $p_h(B) > 0$ (resp., $q_h(B) < |B|$). We denote the family of constrained subsets by

$$\mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h) := \{\, B \subseteq A(h) \mid p_h(B) > 0 \ \text{ or } \ q_h(B) < |B| \,\}.$$

Then, we see that $\mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ is represented as

$$\mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h) = \{\, X \subseteq A(h) \mid \forall B \subseteq \mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h) : p_h(B) \leq |X \cap B| \leq q_h(B) \,\}.$$

For a CSM instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$, an assignment $M \subseteq E$ is called a **matching** (or, said to be **feasible**) if $|M(d)| \leq 1$ for each $d \in D$ and $M(h) \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ for each $h \in H$.

Definition 3.1. For a matching M, an unassigned pair $(d, h) \in E \setminus M$ is a **blocking pair** if (i) d is unassigned or $h \succ_d M(d)$, and (ii) $M(h) + d \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ or $M(h) + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ for some $d' \in M(h)$ with $d \succ_h d'$. A matching M is **stable** if there is no blocking pair.

The Classified Stable Matching, introduced by Huang [16], is the problem to decide the existence of a stable matching of a given CSM instance[1]. Since this is a generalization of HR-LQ, there are instances which have no stable matching. Let us consider envy-freeness for a CSM instance.

Definition 3.2. For a matching M, a doctor d has **justified envy** toward d' with $M(d') = h$ if (i) d is unassigned or $h \succ_d M(d)$ and (ii) $M(h) + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ and $d \succ_h d'$. A matching M is **envy-free** if no doctor has justified envy.

As in the case of HR-LQ, an envy-free matchings can be regarded as a stable matching with reduced upper quotas as follows. For any $h \in H$ and $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ with $0 \leq k \leq q(A(h))$, a function $q'_h : 2^{A(h)} \to \mathbf{Z}$ is called a k-**truncation** of q_h if $q'(A(h)) = k$ and $q'(B) = q(B)$ for every $B \subsetneq A(h)$. Also, we simply say that q'_h is a **truncation** of q_h if there is such $k \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Proposition 3.3. *For $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$, an assignment M is an envy-free matching if and only if M is a stable matching of $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q'_h)\}_{h \in H})$ such that each q'_h is some truncation of q_h.*

Proof. To show the "only if" part, let M be an envy-free matching of I. For each $h \in H$, let q'_h be the $|M(h)|$-truncation of q_h. Then $M(h) \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q'_h)$ and $M(h) + d \notin \mathcal{F}(p_h, q'_h)$ for every $d \in A(h) \setminus M(h)$. That is, M is feasible for I' and there is no doctor who claims a hospital's vacant seat. Therefore, if there is a blocking pair $(d, h) \in E \setminus M$ for I', it follows that d has a justified envy toward some d' with $M(d') = h$, which contradicts the envy-freeness of M. Thus, M is a stable matching of I'.

For the "if" part, let M be a stable matching of I'. Clearly, M is feasible for I. Suppose, to the contrary, some doctor d has justified envy toward d' with $M(d') = h$ with respect to I. Then d is unassigned or $h \succ_d M(d)$. Also, we have $d \succ_h d'$ and $M(h) + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$. Then, $M(h) + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q'_h)$ follows because $|M(h) + d - d'| = |M(h)|$. Hence, (d, h) is a blocking pair in I', a contradiction. □

We provide a hardness result of deciding the existence of an envy-free matching. Here, we assume that evaluation oracles of set functions p_h and q_h are available for each hospital h.

[1] In his original model, each hospital h has a classification $\mathcal{C}_h \subseteq 2^{A(h)}$ and sets a lower and an upper quota for each member of $\mathcal{C}_h$. That is, we are provided $\mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h)$ and values of p_h, q_h on it, rather than set functions p_h, q_h. Our formulation uses set functions to make arguments in the next section simpler.

Theorem 3.4. *It is NP-hard to decide whether a CSM instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$ has an envy-free matching or not. The problem is NP-complete even if the size of $C_h(p_h, q_h)$ is $O(|A(h)|)$ for each $h \in H$.*

Proof. To show the NP-hardness, we reduce a 3-SAT instance $\varphi = c_1 \wedge c_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge c_m$ $(m \geq 2)$ to a CSM instance, where each clause c_j is a disjunction of three literals drawn from boolean variables $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ and their negations, e.g., $c_j = v_1 \vee \neg v_2 \vee \neg v_3$.

For every pair of variable v_i and clause c_j, we have two doctors d_{ij}^T, d_{ij}^F. Also, we have a variable-hospital h_i for each v_i, and a clause-hospital h_j for each c_j. For doctors d_{ij}^T and d_{ij}^F, their acceptable hospitals and preferences are defined as follows.

- If $v_i \in c_j$, then $A(d_{ij}^T) = \{h_i, h_j\}$ and $h_i \succ_{d_{ij}^T} h_j$. Otherwise, $A(d_{ij}^T) = \{h_i\}$,
- if $\neg v_i \in c_j$, then $A(d_{ij}^F) = \{h_i, h_j\}$ and $h_i \succ_{d_{ij}^F} h_j$. Otherwise $A(d_{ij}^F) = \{h_i\}$.

The set E of acceptable pairs are defined to be consistent with these. Then, for each variable-hospital h_i and clause-hospital h_j, we have

$$A(h_i) = \{d_{i1}^T, d_{i1}^F, d_{i2}^T, d_{i2}^F, \ldots d_{im}^T, d_{im}^F\},$$
$$A(h_j) = \{\, d_{ij}^T \mid v_i \in c_j \,\} \cup \{\, d_{ij}^F \mid \neg v_i \in c_j \,\}.$$

For each variable-hospital h_i, define p_{h_i} and q_{h_i} so that

$$\mathcal{C}(p_{h_i}, q_{h_i}) = \bigcup \{\, \{d_{ij}^T, d_{ij}^F\}, \{d_{ij}^F, d_{i(j+1)}^T\} \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \,\},$$
$$p_{h_i}(\{d_{ij}^T, d_{ij}^F\}) = q_{h_i}(\{d_{ij}^T, d_{ij}^F\}) = 1 \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, m),$$
$$p_{h_i}(\{d_{ij}^F, d_{i(j+1)}^T\}) = q_{h_i}(\{d_{ij}^F, d_{i(j+1)}^T\}) = 1 \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, m),$$

where $d_{i(m+1)}^T := d_{i1}^T$. Then, we see that $\mathcal{F}(p_{h_i}, q_{h_i}) = \{D_i^T, D_i^F\}$, where

$$D_i^T := \{\, d_{ij}^T \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \,\}, \quad D_i^F := \{\, d_{ij}^F \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \,\}.$$

For each clause-hospital h_j, define p_{h_i} and q_{h_i} so that $\mathcal{C}(p_{h_j}, q_{h_j}) = \{A(h_j)\}$ and $p_{h_j}(A(h_j)) = 1$, $q_{h_j}(A(h_j)) = |A(h_j)|$. Then, for any set X of doctors,

$$X \in \mathcal{F}(p_{h_j}, q_{h_j}) \iff [\ \exists d_{ij}^T \in X : v_i \in c_j \ \text{ or } \ \exists d_{ij}^F \in X : \neg v_i \in c_j\ ].$$

Define preference lists of hospitals arbitrarily.

Note that $|\mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h)| = O(|A(h|)$ for every hospital. We show that this CSM instance has an envy-free matching if and only if $\varphi = c_1 \wedge c_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge c_m$ $(m \geq 2)$ is satisfiable.

The "only if" part: Suppose that there is an envy-free matching M. Then, for every variable-hospital h_i, $M(h_i)$ is D_i^T or D_i^F. For each h_i, set variable v_i to FALSE if $M(h_i) = D_i^T$, and to TRUE if $M(h_i) = D_i^F$. This boolean assignment satisfies every clause c_j of φ as follows. Since $M(h_j) \in \mathcal{F}(p_{h_j}, q_{h_j})$, either (i) $\exists d_{ij}^T \in M(h_j) : v_i \in c_j$ or (ii) $\exists d_{ij}^F \in M(h_j) : \neg v_i \in c_j$. In the case (i), we have $M(d_{ij}^T) \neq h_i$, and hence $M(h_i) \neq D_i^T$. Then v_i is TRUE. Similarly, in the case (ii), v_i is FALSE, and hence $\neg v_i$ is TRUE. Thus clause c_j is satisfied.

The "if" part: Suppose that there is a boolean assignment satisfying φ. Define M so that

- $M(h_i) = D_i^F$ if v_i is TRUE, and $M(h_i) = D_i^T$ if v_i is FALSE, and
- $M(h_j) = \{\, d_{ij}^T \mid v_i \in c_j,\ v_i \text{ is TRUE} \,\} \cup \{\, d_{ij}^T \mid \neg v_i \in c_j,\ v_i \text{ is FALSE} \,\}$.

Observe that $|M(d)| \leq 1$ for every doctor d, and $M(h) \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ for every hospital h. Then, M is feasible. We now show envy-freeness. Note that every d_{ij}^T with $h_j \in A(d_{ij}^T)$ is assigned to h_i or h_j in M, and prefers h_i to h_j. The same holds for every d_{ij}^F with $h_j \in A(d_{ij}^F)$. Then, there is no doctor d which has justified envy toward d' assigned to some clause-hospital h_j. Also, no doctor d has justified envy toward d' assigned to some variable-hospital h_i, as follows. For any variable-hospital h_i, by $M(h_i) \in \mathcal{F}(p_{h_i}, q_{h_i}) = \{D_i^T, D_i^F\}$ and $|D_i^T \setminus D_i^F| = |D_i^F \setminus D_i^T| = m > 1$, we have $M(h_i) + d - d' \notin \mathcal{F}(p_{h_i}, q_{h_i})$ for any $d \in A(h_i) \setminus M(h_i)$ and $d' \in M(h_i)$. Then no d has justified envy toward d' with $M(d') = h_i$. □

4 Envy-freeness in CSM with Paramodular Quotas

In Section 3, we have shown that it is NP-hard in general to decide whether a CSM instance has an envy-free matching or not. This section shows that the problem is solvable in polynomial time if the pair of quota functions is paramodular for each hospital. All proofs of theorems and corollary in this section are provided in the next section. We first introduce the notion of paramodularity [7].

Let A be a finite set and let $p, q : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$. The pair (p, q) is **paramodular** if

- p is **supermodular**, i.e., $p(B) + p(B') \leq p(B \cup B') + p(B \cap B')$ for every $B, B' \subseteq A$,
- q is **submodular**, i.e., $q(B) + q(B') \geq q(B \cup B') + q(B \cap B')$ for every $B, B' \subseteq A$, and
- the **cross-inequality** $q(B) - p(B') \geq q(B \setminus B') - p(B' \setminus B)$ holds for every $B, B' \subseteq A$.

For a set function $p : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$, its **complement** $\overline{p} : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$ is defined by

$$\overline{p}(B) = p(A) - p(A \setminus B) \quad (B \subseteq A).$$

Recall that, a CSM instance is represented as a tuple $(D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$, where it is assumed that $0 \leq p_h(B) \leq q_h(B) \leq |B|$ for every $h \in H$ and $B \subseteq A(h)$. Here is the main theorem of this section. We denote by $\mathbf{0}$ a set function which is identically zero.

Theorem 4.1. *For a CSM instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$, suppose that (p_h, q_h) is paramodular for each $h \in H$. Then, an instance $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})\}_{h \in H})$ has at least one stable matching and the following three conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *I has an envy-free matching*

(b) *Some stable matching M' of I' satisfies $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for all $h \in H$.*

(c) *Every stable matching M' of I' satisfies $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for all $h \in H$.*

Also, if (b) *holds, then M' is an envy-free matching of I.*

As will be shown in Section 5, the existence of a stable matching of I' and the equivalence between (b) and (c) are easy corollaries of Fleiner's results on the matroid framework [3, 4]. Then, a difficult part is to show the equivalence between conditions (a) and (b).

Theorem 4.1 implies that we can decide the existence of an envy-free matching of $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$ by the following algorithm.

Step1. Find a stable matching M' of $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})\}_{h \in H})$.

Step2. If $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for every $h \in H$, then return M'. Otherwise, return "there is no envy-free matching."

It will be shown in Section 5 that Step1 (i.e., finding a stable matching of I') can be done efficiently by the lattice fixed point method studied in [3, 4]. The detailed description of the algorithm is shown below. Here, for each $h \in H$, $N \subseteq E$, and $d \in N(h)$, we use the notation $N(h)_{\succ_h d} := \{\, d' \in N(h) \mid d' \succ_h d \,\}$ and $N(h)_{\succeq_h d} := \{\, d' \in N(h) \mid d' \succ_h d \ \text{ or } \ d' = d \,\}$.

Algorithm 1: EF-Paramodular-CSM

Input: $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$ such that each (p_h, q_h) is paramodular
Output: return an envy-free matching M', or "there is no ency-free matching."

Set $N_D \leftarrow E$, $N_H \leftarrow \emptyset$, and let M' be undefined;
while M' *is undefined* **do**
  $R_D \leftarrow \bigcup_{d \in D} \{\, (d, h) \mid h \in N_D(d),\ h \neq \max_{\succ_d} N_D(d) \,\}$;
  $R_H \leftarrow \bigcup_{h \in H} \{\, (d, h) \mid d \in N_H(h),\ p(A(h) \setminus N_H(h)_{\succeq_h d}) = p(A(h) \setminus N_H(h)_{\succ_h d}) \,\}$;
  if $(N_D, N_H) = (E \setminus R_H, E \setminus R_D)$ **then**
    let $M' \leftarrow N_D \cap N_H$ and **break**;
  else
    update $(N_D, N_H) \leftarrow (E \setminus R_H, E \setminus R_D)$;
  end
end
if $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ *for all* $h \in H$ **then**
  return M';
else
  return "there is no envy-free matching";
end

In Section 5, we also analyze the time complexity of this algorithm and obtain the following.

Theorem 4.2. *For a CSM instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$ such that each (p_h, q_h) is paramodular, the algorithm* EF-Paramodular-CSM *decides whether I has an envy-free matching or not in $O(|E|^2)$ time, provided that evaluation oracles of $\{p_h\}_{h \in H}$ are available.*

Combining Theorem 4.2 with Proposition 5.2 in the next section, we obtain the following corollary. Note that, a family $\mathcal{L}$ of subsets is called **laminar** (or hierarchical, or nested) if any $X, Y \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ satisfy $X \subseteq Y$ or $X \supseteq Y$ or $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$.

Corollary 4.3. *For a CSM instance $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h \in H})$, if the constrained set family $\mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h)$ is laminar for each $h \in H$, then one can decide whether I has an envy-free matching or not in time polynomial in $|E|$, given $\mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h)$ and values of p_h and q_h on it for each $h \in H$.*

Remark 4.4. Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 generalize Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 as follows. For a pair (l_h, u_h) of nonnegative integers with $0 \leq u_h \leq l_h \leq |A(h)|$, define $p_h, q_h : 2^{A(h)} \to \mathbf{Z}$ by

$$p_h(B) = \max\{0, l_h - |A(h) \setminus B|\},$$
$$q_h(B) = \min\{u_h, |B|\}.$$

Then, (p_h, q_h) is paramodular and $\mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h) = \{\, X \subseteq A(h) \mid l_h \leq |X| \leq u_h \,\}$ holds. Hence, envy-freeness for $(D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{l_h, u_h\}_{h \in H})$ coincide with that for $(D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{p_h, q_h\}_{h \in H})$. Also, we can check $p_h(A(h)) = \max\{0, l_h - |A(h) \setminus A(h)|\} = l_h$.

5 Proofs for Section 4

In this section, we provide proofs of Theorems 4.1, 4.2, and Corollary 4.3. This section consists of six subsections, and the first three introduce notions and previous results needed for the proofs. More precisely, Sections 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 respectively introduce notions of generalized matroids, choice functions induced from matroids, and the lattice fixed point method for stable matchings. Using them, the last three subsections provide the proofs of our results.

5.1 Generalized Matroids

For a finite set A and a family $\mathcal{J} \subseteq 2^A$, the pair $(A, \mathcal{J})$ is called a **generalized matroid** [30] (**g-matroid**, for short) if $\mathcal{J}$ is nonempty and satisfies the following property called **simultaneous** (or **symmetric**) **exchange property** [24].

($\mathbf{B^\natural}$-EXC) For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{J}$ and $e \in X \setminus Y$, we have
(i) $X - e \in \mathcal{J}$, $Y + e \in \mathcal{J}$ or
(ii) there exists some $e' \in Y \setminus X$ such that $X - e + e' \in \mathcal{J}$, $Y + e - e' \in \mathcal{J}$.

The family $\mathcal{J}$ of a g-matroid $(A, \mathcal{J})$ is also called an **$\mathbf{M^\natural}$-convex family** [22, 23]. (There are various characterizations for g-matroids. See, e.g., Tardos [30], Frank [7] and Murota [22] for more information on g-matroid and its extensions.)

For set functions $p, q : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$, the pair (p, q) is called **g-matroidal** if it is paramodular and satisfies $0 \leq p(B) \leq q(B) \leq |B|$ for every $B \subseteq A$. As its name indicates, there is a one-to-one correspondence between generalized matroids and g-matroidal pairs (see, e.g., [7, 8]).

Proposition 5.1. *A pair $(A, \mathcal{J})$ is a g-matroid if and only if $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{F}(p, q)$ for some g-matroidal pair (p, q). Such a g-matroidal pair is uniquely defined by $p(B) = \min\{\ |X \cap B| \mid X \in \mathcal{J}\}$ and $q(B) = \max\{\ |X \cap B| \mid X \in \mathcal{J}\}$ for every $B \subseteq A$.*

One useful fact on g-matroids is that they arise from laminar (or hierarchical) constraints as follows. (See Frank [7], Murota [22], Yokoi [33] for examples of g-matroids.)

Proposition 5.2 (Laminar G-matroid). *For set functions $p, q : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$, suppose that the constrained set family $\mathcal{C}(p, q) := \{\ B \subseteq A \mid p(B) > 0$ or $q(B) < |B|\ \}$ is laminar and $\mathcal{F}(p, q) \neq \emptyset$. Then, there exists a g-matroidal pair $(\hat{p}, \hat{q})$ such that $\mathcal{F}(\hat{p}, \hat{q}) = \mathcal{F}(p, q)$, and hence $(A, \mathcal{F}(p, q))$ is a g-matroid.*

A function $r : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$ is called a **matroid rank function** if it is submodular, monotone (i.e., $B \subseteq B' \subseteq A$ implies $r(B) \leq r(B')$), and satisfies $0 \leq r(B) \leq |B|$ for every $B \subseteq A$. The submodularity of r is equivalent to the following **diminishing returns property**: for any $B' \subseteq B \subseteq A$ and $e \in A \setminus B$, we have

$$r(B + e) - r(B) \leq r(B' + e) - r(B').$$

In particular, a matroid rank function satisfies $0 \leq r(B + e) - r(B) \leq r(\{e\}) - r(\emptyset) \leq 1$ for any $B \subseteq A$ and $e \in A \setminus B$.

A pair $(A, \mathcal{I})$ is called a **matroid** if it is a g-matroid and $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$. In terms of quota functions, a pair $(A, \mathcal{I})$ is a matroid if there is a matroid rank function r such that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, r)$. Indeed, we can check that the pair $(\mathbf{0}, r)$ is g-matroidal for any matroid rank function r.

5.2 Choice Functions Induced from Matroid Rank Functions

Let $r : 2^A \to \mathbf{Z}$ be a matroid rank function on A and $\succ$ be a linear order on A. Let $\mathscr{M} = (A, r, \succ)$ and define a function $C_{\mathscr{M}} : 2^A \to 2^A$ as follows. Let $n = |A|$ and, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, let e_i be the i-th best element of A with respect to $\succ$, i.e. $e_1 \succ e_2 \succ \cdots \succ e_n$. Let $A_0 := \emptyset$ and $A_i := \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_i\}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Then, define $C_{\mathscr{M}}$ by

$$C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) := \{\, e_i \in X \mid r(A_i \cap X) > r(A_{i-1} \cap X) \,\} \quad (X \subseteq A).$$

We call $C_{\mathscr{M}}$ the **choice function induced from** $\mathscr{M} = (A, r, \succ)$. Note that, for any $e_i \in A$ and $X \subseteq A$, the value of $r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X)$ is 1 or 0 by the monotonicity and submodularity of r. Also, $e_i \in A \setminus X$ implies $r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 0$. Then, for any $X \subseteq A$, we have

$$C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) = \{\, e_i \in A \mid r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 1 \,\}, \tag{1}$$
$$X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) = \{\, e_i \in X \mid r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 0 \,\}. \tag{2}$$

Such a choice function was introduced by Fleiner [3, 4] and used in several works [2, 5, 33], In these works, matroids are usually given by independent set families rather than matroid rank functions. The following propositions (Propositions 5.3–5.7) are known facts, but we provide alternative proofs in terms of matroid rank functions.

Proposition 5.3. *For any $X \subseteq A$, we have $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, r)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show $|C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap B| \leq r(B)$ for any $B \subseteq A$. By (1), we have $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap B = \{\, e_i \in A \mid r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 1,\ e_i \in B \,\}$. For any $e_i \in B$, since $A_{i-1} \cap X \cap B \subseteq A_{i-1} \cap X$ and $A_i \cap X \cap B = (A_{i-1} \cap X \cap B) + e_i$, the diminishing returns property of r implies

$$r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) \leq r(A_i \cap X \cap B) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X \cap B).$$

Thus, $e_i \in B$, $r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 1$ imply $r(A_i \cap X \cap B) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X \cap B) = 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap B| &= |\,\{\, e_i \in A \mid r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 1,\ e_i \in B \,\}\,| \\ &\leq |\,\{\, e_i \in A \mid r(A_i \cap X \cap B) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X \cap B) = 1 \,\}\,| \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{i:1 \leq i \leq n} [\, r(A_i \cap X \cap B) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X \cap B) \,] = r(X \cap B). \end{aligned}$$

The monotonicity of r implies $r(X \cap B) \leq r(B)$, and the proof is completed. □

Proposition 5.4. *For every $X \subseteq A$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we have $|C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap A_j| = r(A_j \cap X)$. In particular, $|C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)| = r(X)$.*

Proof. By (1), we have $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap A_j = \{\, e_i \in A_j \mid r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 1 \,\}$. This implies $|C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap A_i| = \sum_{i:1 \leq i \leq j} [\, r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) \,] = r(A_j \cap X) - r(A_0 \cap X) = r(A_j \cap X)$. □

Proposition 5.5. *$C_{\mathscr{M}}$ is* **substitutable**, *i.e., $X \subseteq Y \subseteq A$ implies $X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \subseteq Y \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(Y)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $e_i \in X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$ for some i. This implies $r(A_i \cap X) - r(A_{i-1} \cap X) = 0$ by (2). By the diminishing returns property and $X \subseteq Y$, the value of $r(A_i \cap Y) - r(A_{i-1} \cap Y)$ is also 0, and hence $e_i \in Y \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(Y)$ by (2). □

Proposition 5.6. *$C_{\mathscr{M}}$ is* **size-monotone**, *i.e., $X \subseteq Y \subseteq A$ implies $|C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)| \leq |C_{\mathscr{M}}(Y)|$.*

Proof. This immediately follows from Proposition 5.4 and the monotonicity of r. □

Proposition 5.7. *For any $X \subseteq A$, the set $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$* **dominates** *every element in $X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$. That is, the following two hold.*

- *For every $e \in X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$, we have $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) + e \notin \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, r)$.*
- *For every $e \in X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$ and $e' \in C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$, if $e \succ e'$, then $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) + e - e' \notin \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, r)$.*

Proof. Let i be the index such that $e = e_i$, i.e., e is the i-th best element for $\succ$. By Proposition 5.4, we have $|C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap A_i| = r(A_i \cap X)$. With $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \subseteq X$ and $e_i \in X \setminus C_{\mathscr{M}}(X)$, this implies $|(C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) + e_i) \cap (A_i \cap X)| = |C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap A_i| + 1 > r(A_i \cap X)$, and hence $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) + e_i \notin \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, r)$.

For the second claim, let i' be the index such that $e' = e_{i'}$. Then, $e \succ e'$ implies $i < i'$, and hence $e_{i'} \notin A_i$. This yields $|(C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) + e_i - e_{i'}) \cap (A_i \cap X)| = |C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) \cap A_i| + 1 > r(A_i \cap X)$, which implies $C_{\mathscr{M}}(X) + e_i - e_{i'} \notin \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, r)$. □

5.3 Fixed Point Method for Stable Matchings on Matroids

Here we introduce the lattice fixed point framework for stable matchings on matroids, studied by Fleiner [3, 4] (see also Hatfield and Milgrom [15]).

Let $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{\mathbf{0}, r_h\}_{h \in H})$ be a CSM instance such that r_h is a matroid rank function for each $h \in H$. That is, each hospital has a matroidal upper quota function and no lower quota.

From $(D, E, \{\succ_d\}_{d \in D})$, we define doctors' joint choice function $C_D : 2^E \to 2^E$. For any set $N \subseteq E$, let $C_D(N)$ be the set of each doctor's best choices among N, i.e.,

$$C_D(N) := \bigcup_{d \in D} \{\, (d, h) \mid h \in N(d),\ h = \max_{\succ_d} N(d) \,\} \quad (N \subseteq E).$$

From $(H, E, \{\succ_h\}_{h \in H}, \{r_h\}_{h \in H})$, we define hospitals' joint choice function $C_H : 2^E \to 2^E$. First, for each hospital $h \in H$, let $C_h : 2^{A(h)} \to 2^{A(h)}$ be a choice function induced from $(A(h), r_h, \succ_h)$ as in Section 5.2. Then, define C_H by

$$C_H(N) := \bigcup_{h \in H} \{\, (d, h) \mid d \in N(h),\ d \in C_h(N(h)) \,\} \quad (N \subseteq E).$$

Define rejection functions $R_D, R_H : 2^E \to 2^E$ by

$$R_D(N) = N \setminus C_D(N), \quad R_H(N) = N \setminus C_H(N) \quad (N \subseteq E),$$

and a function $F_I : 2^E \times 2^E \to 2^E \times 2^E$ by

$$F_I(N_D, N_H) = (E \setminus R_H(N_H),\ E \setminus R_D(N_D)) \quad (N_D, N_H \subseteq E).$$

Proposition 5.8 (Fleiner [3, 4])**.** *For $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{\mathbf{0}, r_h\}_{h \in H})$ such that each r_h is a matroid rank function, if (N_D, N_H) is a fixed point of F_I, then $N_D \cap N_H = C_D(N_D) = C_H(N_H)$ holds and $N_D \cap N_H$ is a stable matching of I.*

Let $\geq$ be a partial order defined on $2^E \times 2^E$ as

$$(N_D, N_H) \geq (N'_D, N'_H) \iff [N_D \supseteq N'_D,\ N_H \subseteq N'_H]$$

Recall that C_h is substitutable for each $h \in H$, This implies the following property of F_I.

Proposition 5.9 (Fleiner [3, 4])**.** *For $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{\mathbf{0}, r_h\}_{h \in H})$ such that each r_h is a matroid rank function, the function F_I is monotone with respect to $\geq$. That is, $(N_D, N_H) \geq (N'_D, N'_H)$ implies $F_I(N_D, N_H) \geq F_I(N'_D, N'_H)$.*

The monotonicity of F_I implies the existence of a stable matching as follows.

Proposition 5.10 (Fleiner [3, 4]). *Let $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{\mathbf{0}, r_h\}_{h\in H})$ be an instance such that each r_h is a matroid rank function. One can find a stable matching in $O(|E| \cdot \mathrm{EO}_{DH})$ time, where EO_{DH} is a time to compute $C_D(N)$ and $C_H(N)$ for any $N \subseteq E$.*

Proof. Since $(E, \emptyset)$ is the maximum in $2^E \times 2^E$ with respect to $\geq$, we have $(E, \emptyset) \geq F_I(E, \emptyset)$. As F_I is monotone by Proposition 5.9, then

$$(E, \emptyset) \geq F_I(E, \emptyset) \geq F_I(F_I(E, \emptyset)) \geq \cdots \geq F_I^k(E, \emptyset) \geq \cdots .$$

Since $2^E \times 2^E$ is a finite lattice whose longest chain is of length $2|E|$, we have $F_I^k(E, \emptyset) = F_I(F_I^k(E, \emptyset))$ for some $k \leq 2|E|$. Then, $(N_D^*, N_H^*) := F_I^k(E, \emptyset)$ is a fixed point of F_I and, by Proposition 5.8, $N_D^* \cap N_H^*$ is a stable matching of I. □

Fleiner also provided the following structural result on the set of stable matchings.

Proposition 5.11 (Fleiner [3, 4]). *Let $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{\mathbf{0}, r_h\}_{h\in H})$ be an instance such that each r_h is a matroid rank function. For any two stable matchings $M, M' \subseteq E$ of I and any hospital $h \in H$, we have $|M(h)| = |M'(h)|$.*

5.4 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We are now ready to show Theorem 4.1. Recall that I and I' are defined as

$$I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(p_h, q_h)\}_{h\in H}),$$
$$I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})\}_{h\in H}),$$

where (p_h, q_h) is g-matroidal (i.e., is paramodular and satisfies $0 \leq p_h(B) \leq q_h(B) \leq |B|$) for each $h \in H$. Here, $\overline{p_h}$ is the complement of p_h defined as $\overline{p_h}(B) = p_h(A(h)) - p_h(A(h) \setminus B)$. Observe the following basic fact of a g-matroidal pair.

Claim 5.12. *$\overline{p_h}$ is a matroid rank function and $\overline{p_h}(A(h)) = p_h(A(h))$ for each $h \in H$.*

Proof. Since (p_h, q_h) is g-matroidal, p_h is supermodular and $0 \leq p_h(B) \leq |B|$ for every $B \subseteq A(h)$. Then, for any $B' \subseteq B \subseteq A(h)$, we have $p_h(B') \leq p_h(B') + p_h(B \setminus B') \leq p_h(B) + p_h(\emptyset) = p_h(B)$, i.e., p_h is monotone. Then, $\overline{p_h}$ is submodular, monotone, and $0 \leq \overline{p_h}(B) \leq |B|$ for every $B \subseteq A(h)$, i.e., $\overline{p_h}$ is a matroid rank function. Also, $\overline{p_h}(A(h)) = p_h(A(h)) - p_h(\emptyset) = p_h(A(h))$. □

By Claim 5.12, Propositions 5.10 and 5.11 imply the following.

Lemma 5.13. *I' has a stable matching. Also, for any stable matchings M, M' of I and any hospital $h \in H$, we have $|M(h)| = |M'(h)|$.*

Lemma 5.13 implies that I' has a stable matching and that conditions (b) and (c) in Theorem 4.1 are equivalent.

What is left is to show that the condition (a) is also equivalent. For this purpose, we prepare the following three claims. The first and second claims are basic facts of paramodular functions [7]. The third one utilizes the exchange property of g-matroids ($\mathrm{M}^\natural$-convex families).

Claim 5.14. *For any $h \in H$ and $X \subseteq A(h)$, suppose that $|X| = \overline{p_h}(A(h)) = p_h(A)$ holds. Then, we have $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})$ if and only if $X \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$.*

Proof. We abbreviate p_h, q_h, $A(h)$ to p, q, A, respectively, and denote $\overline{B} := A \setminus B$ for $B \subseteq A$.

To show the "if" part, suppose $X \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$. Then $|X \cap \overline{B}| \geq p(\overline{B})$ for any $B \subseteq A$. Since $|X| = p(A)$, then $|X \cap B| = |X| - |X \cap \overline{B}| \leq p(A) - p(\overline{B}) = \overline{p}(B)$. Thus, $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p})$.

To show the "only if" part, suppose $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p})$. We show $p(B) \leq |X \cap B| \leq q(B)$ for any $B \subseteq A$. By the cross-inequality $q(B) - p(A) \geq q(B \setminus A) - p(A \setminus B)$, we have $q(B) \geq p(A) - p(\overline{B})$, which implies $|X \cap B| \leq \overline{p}(B) = p(A) - p(\overline{B}) \leq q(B)$, and thus $|X \cap B| \leq q(B)$. Also, since $|X \cap \overline{B}| \leq \overline{p}(\overline{B}) = p(A) - p(B)$, we have $|X \cap B| = |X| - |X \cap \overline{B}| \geq p(A) - (p(A) - p(B)) = p(B)$. Thus, $|X \cap B| \geq p(B)$. □

Since $\overline{p_h}$ is a matroid rank function for each $h \in H$, we can define the choice function $C_h : 2^{A(h)} \to 2^{A(h)}$ induced from $(A(h), \overline{p_h}, \succ_h)$ as in Section 5.3.

Claim 5.15. *For any $h \in H$, let C_h be the choice function induced from $(A(h), \overline{p_h}, \succ_h)$. For $Y \subseteq A(h)$ if there exists $X \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ such that $X \subseteq Y$, then $|C_h(Y)| = p_h(A(h))$.*

Proof. We abbreviate p_h, q_h, $A(h)$, C_h to p, q, A, C, respectively.

By Proposition 5.3, $C(Y) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p})$, and hence $|C(Y)| = |C(Y) \cap A| \leq \overline{p}(A)$. Also, Propositions 5.4 and 5.6 implies $\overline{p}(X) = |C(X)| \leq |C(Y)|$. Since $X \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$, we have $0 \leq p(A \setminus X) \leq |X \cap (A \setminus X)| = 0$, and hence $\overline{p}(X) = p(A) - p(A \setminus X) = p(A) = \overline{p}(A)$. Combining these yields $\overline{p}(A) \leq |C(X)| \leq \overline{p}(A)$, and hence $|C(X)| = \overline{p}(A) = p(A)$. □

Claim 5.16. *For any $h \in H$, let C_h be the choice function induced from $(A(h), \overline{p_h}, \succ_h)$. Suppose that $X, Y \subseteq A(h)$ satisfy*

- *$X \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ and $X \subseteq Y$, and*
- *for every $d \in Y \setminus X$ and $d' \in X$, if $d \succ_h d'$, then $X + d - d' \notin \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$.*

Then, $C_h(Y) \subseteq X$.

Proof. We abbreviate p_h, q_h, $A(h)$, C_h to p, q, A, C, respectively.

By Claim 5.15, $X \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$ and $X \subseteq Y$ imply $|C(Y)| = p(A) = \overline{p}(A)$. Also, $C(Y) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p})$ by Proposition 5.3. Then, Claim 5.14 implies $C(Y) \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$. Thus, $X, C(Y) \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$. Suppose, to the contrary, $C(Y) \subsetneq X$. Then there is some $d \in C(Y) \setminus X$. By the symmetric exchange axiom **(B$^\natural$-EXC)** for $C(X)$, Y, and d, we have either (i) $C(Y) - d,\ X + d \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$, or (ii) $\exists d' \in X \setminus C(Y) : C(Y) - d + d',\ X + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$. Note that (i) cannot hold since $C(Y) - d \notin \mathcal{F}(p,q)$ follows from $|C(Y) - d| < |C(Y)| = p(A)$. Then, (ii) holds, i.e., there exists $d' \in X \setminus C(Y)$ such that $C(Y) - d + d',\ X + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$.

By $d \in C(Y) \setminus X \subseteq Y \setminus X$ and $d' \in X$ and $X + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$ the assumption on Y implies $d' \succ_h d$. On the other hand, by $|C(Y) - d + d'| = |C(Y)| = p(A)$, Proposition 5.14 and $C(Y) - d + d' \in \mathcal{F}(p,q)$ imply $C(Y) - d + d' \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p})$. As $d \in C(Y) \setminus X \subseteq C(Y)$ and $d' \in X \setminus C(Y) \subseteq Y \setminus C(Y)$, this implies $d \succ_h d'$ by Proposition 5.7, a contradiction. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 4.1 by showing the following claim, which states the equivalence between conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 5.17. *I has an envy-free matching if and only if some stable matching M' of I' satisfies $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for all $h \in H$.*

Proof. **The "if" part:** Let M' be a stable matching of I' such that $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for all $h \in H$. We show that M' is also an envy-free matching of I.

As M' is feasible for I', we have $|M'(d)| \leq 1$ for every $d \in D$ and $M'(h) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})$ for every $h \in H$. By Claim 5.14 and $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$, then $M'(h) \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$, and hence M' is also a matching in I. Suppose, to the contrary, that there is a doctor $d \in D$ who has justified envy toward $d' \in D$ with $M'(d') = h$. Then, (i) d is unassigned or $h \succ_h M'(d)$ and (ii) $M'(h) + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ and $d \succ_h d'$. Note that $|M'(h) + d - d'| = |M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$. Then, Claim 5.14 implies $M'(h) + d - d' \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})$. This means that (d, h) is a blocking pair for M' in I', a contradiction.

The "only if" part: Suppose that I has an envy-free matching M. We now construct a stable matching M' of I' satisfying $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for all $h \in H$.

For $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})\}_{h \in H})$, define $C_D, C_H : 2^E \to 2^E$ as in Section 5.3. That is, C_D returns the set of each doctor's best choices and C_H is defined by combining $\{C_h\}_{h \in H}$, where C_h is induced from $(A(h), \overline{p_h}, \succ_h)$. From C_D and C_H, we define $F_{I'} : 2^E \times 2^E \to 2^E \times 2^E$ as in Section 5.3. Define two supersets $N_D, N_H \subseteq E$ of M by

$$\begin{aligned} N_D &:= M \cup \{\, (d, h) \in E \setminus M \mid M(d) \succ_d h \,\}, \\ N_H &:= M \cup (E \setminus N_D). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $N_H \setminus M = E \setminus N_D$, and hence every $(d, h) \subseteq N_H \setminus M$ satisfies $(d, h) \notin N_D$, and hence $h \succ_d M(d)$. Since M is an envy-free matching, then for every $d' \in M(h)$ with $d \succ_h d'$ we have $M(h) + d - d' \notin \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$, since otherwise d has justified envy toward d'. Thus, we have

- $M(h) \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$ and $M(h) \subseteq N_H(h)$, and
- for every $d \in N_H(h) \setminus M(h)$ and $d' \in M(h)$, if $d \succ_h d'$, then $M(h) + d - d' \notin \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$.

Claim 5.16 then implies $C_h(N_H(h)) \subseteq M(h)$ for each $h \in H$, and hence $C_H(N_H) \subseteq M$.

$$E \setminus R_H(N_H) = (E \setminus N_H) \cup C_H(N_H) \subseteq (E \setminus N_H) \cup M = N_D. \tag{3}$$

Also, by the definition of C_D and N_D, we have $C_D(N_D) = M$, which implies

$$E \setminus R_D(N_D) = (E \setminus N_D) \cup C_D(N_D) = (E \setminus N_D) \cup M = N_H. \tag{4}$$

Recall the partial order $\geq$ defined on $2^E \times 2^E$ in Section 5.3. By (3) and (4), we have

$$(N_D, N_H) \geq (E \setminus R_H(N_H), E \setminus R_D(N_D)) = F_{I'}(N_D, N_H).$$

Since $F_{I'}$ is monotone by Proposition 5.9, this implies

$$(N_D, N_H) \geq F_{I'}(N_D, N_H) \geq F_{I'}(F_{I'}(N_D, N_H)) \geq \cdots \geq F_{I'}^k(N_D, N_H) \geq \cdots,$$

and hence there is k such that $F_{I'}^k(N_D, N_H)$ is a fixed point of $F_{I'}$. Denote it by (N_D^k, N_D^k) and define $M' := C_H(N_H^k)$. By Proposition 5.8, M' is a stable matching of I'.

What is left is to show $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ for all $h \in H$. Since $(N_D, N_H) \geq F_{I'}^k(N_D, N_H) = (N_D^k, N_D^k)$, we have $N_H \subseteq N_H^k$, Then $M \subseteq C_H(N_H) \subseteq N_H \subseteq N_H^k$, and hence $M(h) \subseteq N_H^k(h)$ for each $h \in H$. As $M(h) \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$, Claim 5.15 implies $|M'(h)| = |C_h(N_H^k(h))| = p_h(A(h))$, $\square$

Combining Lemmas 5.13 and 5.17 completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

5.5 Proof of Theorem 4.2

We first show that the "while loop" of the algorithm EF-Paramodular-CSM computes a stable matching of $I' = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(\mathbf{0}, \overline{p_h})\}_{h \in H})$. By the proof of Proposition 5.10, it suffices to show that, each iteration updates (N_D, N_H) to $F_{I'}(N_D, N_H)$. That is, we show that

$$R_D := \bigcup_{d \in D} \{\, (d,h) \mid h \in N_D(d),\ h \neq \max_{\succ_d} N_D(d) \,\},$$
$$R_H := \bigcup_{h \in H} \{\, (d,h) \mid d \in N_H(h),\ p_h(A(h) \setminus N_H(h)_{\succeq_h d}) = p_h(A(h) \setminus N_H(h)_{\succ_h d}) \,\}.$$

in the algorithm coincide with $N_D \setminus C_D(N_D)$ and $N_H \setminus C_H(N_H)$, respectively, where C_D and C_H are defined for I' as in Section 5.3. By definition, $R_D = N_D \setminus C_D(N_D)$ can be checked easily. To show $R_H = N_H \setminus C_H(N_H)$, recall the definition of C_H in Section 5.3.

$$C_H(N) = \bigcup_{h \in H} \{\, (d,h) \mid d \in N(h),\ d \in C_h(N(h)) \,\} \quad (N \subseteq E).$$

Here, each $C_h : 2^{A(h)} \to 2^{A(h)}$ is a choice function induced from $(A(h), \overline{p_h}, \succ_h)$. By definitions of C_h and $\overline{p_h}$, for any $N \subseteq E$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_h(N(h)) &= \{\, d \in N(h) \mid \overline{p_h}(N(h)_{\succeq_h d}) > \overline{p_h}(N(h)_{\succ_h d}) \,\}, \\ &= \{\, d \in N(h) \mid p_h(A(h) \setminus N(h)_{\succeq_h d}) < p_h(A(h) \setminus N(h)_{\succ_h d}) \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of p_h (shown in the proof of Claim 5.12), for any $d \in N(h)$, we have $p_h(A(h) \setminus N(h)_{\succeq_h d}) \leq p_h(A(h) \setminus N(h)_{\succ_h d})$. Then, for any $h \in H$, $N \subseteq E$, and $d \in N(h)$,

$$d \in N(h) \setminus C_h(N(h)) \iff p_h(A(h) \setminus N(h)_{\succeq_h d}) = p_h(A(h) \setminus N(h)_{\succ_h d}).$$

Thus, we have $R_H = N_H \setminus C_H(N_H)$.

We now analyze the time complexity. As shown in Proposition 5.10, a stable matching is found by computing $F_{I'}$ at most $2|E|$ times, i.e., the "while loop" is iterated $O(|E|)$ times. Also, we see that each iteration can be done in $O(|E|)$ time. Moreover, we can check the condition $|M'(h)| = p_h(A(h))$ $(h \in H)$ in $O(|E|)$ time. Thus, the algorithm runs in $O(|E|^2)$ time.

5.6 Proof of Corollary 4.3

For each $h \in H$, as the constrained set family $\mathcal{C}(p_h, q_h)$ is laminar, Proposition 5.2 implies that there is a g-matroidal pair $(\hat{p}_h, \hat{q}_h)$ with $\mathcal{F}(\hat{p}_h, \hat{q}_h) = \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)$. Then, the given instance is equivalent to $I = (D, H, E, \succ_{DH}, \{(\hat{p}_h, \hat{q}_h)\}_{h \in H})$, where $(\hat{p}_h, \hat{q}_h)$ is paramodular for each $h \in H$.

Since we have Theorem 4.2, it completes the proof to show that we can simulate an evaluation oracle of each $\hat{p}_h$ in time polynomial in $|E|$. By Proposition 5.1, for each $B \subseteq A(h)$, the value of $\hat{p}_h(B)$ is obtained as

$$\hat{p}_h(B) = \min\{\ |X \cap B| \mid X \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h)\}.$$

Consider a weight function w_B on $A(h)$ such that $w_B(d) = 1$ for every $d \in B$ and $w_B(d) = 0$ for every $d \in A(h) \setminus B$. Then, $\hat{p}_h(B) = \min\{\, w_B(X) \mid X \in \mathcal{F}(p_h, q_h) \,\}$, which is a weight minimization problem on a laminar g-matroid. As shown in Appendix of [33], this can be reduced to the minimum cost circulation problem, which is solved in polynomial time [25, 31]. Since the size of obtained network is polynomial in $|A(h)| = O(|E|)$, we can compute $\hat{p}_h(B)$ in time polynomial in $|E|$. (See [33] for the reduction to the minimum cost circulation problem.)

References

[1] A. Arulselvan, Á. Cseh, M. Groß, D. F. Manlove, and J. Matuschke: Matchings with lower quotas: Algorithms and complexity, *Algorithmica*, (2016), pp. 1–24.

[2] P. Biró, T. Fleiner, R. W. Irving, and D. F. Manlove: The college admissions problem with lower and common quotas, *Theoretical Computer Science*, **411** (2010), pp. 3136–3153.

[3] T. Fleiner: A matroid generalization of the stable matching polytope, *Proc. Eighth IPCO,* Lecture Notes in Computer Science **2081**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin & Heidelberg, 2001, pp. 105–114.

[4] T. Fleiner: A fixed-point approach to stable matchings and some applications, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **28** (2003), pp. 103–126.

[5] T. Fleiner and N. Kamiyama: A matroid approach to stable matchings with lower quotas, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **41** (2016), pp. 734–744.

[6] D. Fragiadakis, A. Iwasaki, P. Troyan, S. Ueda, and M. Yokoo: Strategyproof matching with minimum quotas, *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, **4** (2016), pp. 6:1–6:40.

[7] A. Frank: *Connections in Combinatorial Optimization,* Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 38, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.

[8] A. Frank and É. Tardos: Generalized polymatroids and submodular flows, *Mathematical Programming*, **42** (1988), pp. 489–563.

[9] D. Gale and L. S. Shapley: College admissions and the stability of marriage, *American Mathematical Monthly*, **69** (1962), pp. 9–15.

[10] D. Gale and M. Sotomayor: Some remarks on the stable matching problem, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **11** (1985), pp. 223–232.

[11] M. Goto, A. Iwasaki, Y. Kawasaki, R. Kurata, Y. Yasuda, and M. Yokoo: Strategyproof matching with regional minimum and maximum quotas, *Artificial Intelligence*, **235** (2016), pp. 40–57.

[12] D. Gusfield and R. W. Irving: *The Stable Marriage Problem: Structure and Algorithms*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1989.

[13] K. Hamada, K. Iwama, and S. Miyazaki: The hospitals/residents problem with quota lower bounds, *Proc. 19th ESA,* Lecture Notes in Computer Science **6942**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin & Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 180–191.

[14] K. Hamada, K. Iwama, and S. Miyazaki: The hospitals/residents problem with lower quotas, *Algorithmica*, **74** (2016), pp. 440–465.

[15] J. W. Hatfield and P. R. Milgrom: Matching with contracts, *American Economic Review*, **95** (2005), pp. 913–935.

[16] C. C. Huang: Classified stable matching, *Proc. 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA2010)*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2010, pp. 1235–1253.

[17] Y. Kamada and F. Kojima: Efficient matching under distributional constraints: Theory and applications, *The American Economic Review*, **105** (2014), pp. 67–99.

[18] Y. Kamada and F. Kojima: Stability concepts in matching under distributional constraints, *Journal of Economic Theory*, **168** (2017), pp. 107–142.

[19] Ehlers L., Hafalir I. E., Yenmez M. B., and Yildirim M. A.: School choice with controlled choice constraints: Hard bounds versus soft bounds, *Journal of Economic Theory*, **153** (2014), pp. 648 – 683.

[20] D. F. Manlove: *Algorithmics of Matching under Preferences*, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2013.

[21] M. Mnich and I. Schlotter: Stable marriage with covering constraints: A complete computational trichotomy, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.08230*, (2016).

[22] K. Murota: *Discrete Convex Analysis*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2003.

[23] K. Murota: Discrete convex analysis: A tool for economics and game theory, *Journal of Mechanism and Institution Design*, **1** (2016), pp. 151–273.

[24] K. Murota and A. Shioura: M-convex function on generalized polymatroid, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **24** (1999), pp. 95–105.

[25] J. B. Orlin: A faster strongly polynomial minimum cost flow algorithm, *Operations Research*, **41** (1993), pp. 338–350.

[26] A. E. Roth: The evolution of the labor market for medical interns and residents: A case study in game theory, *The Journal of Political Economy*, **92** (1984), pp. 991–1016.

[27] A. E. Roth: Stability and polarization of interests in job matching, *Econometrica*, **52** (1984), pp. 47–57.

[28] A. E. Roth: On the allocation of residents to rural hospitals: A general property of two-sided matching markets, *Econometrica*, **54** (1986), pp. 425–427.

[29] A. E. Roth and M. A. O. Sotomayor: *Two-Sided Matching: A Study in Game-Theoretic Modeling and Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[30] É. Tardos: Generalized matroids and supermodular colourings, *Matroid Theory* (L. Lovász and A. Recski, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, pp. 359–382.

[31] É. Tardos: A strongly polynomial minimum cost circulation algorithm, *Combinatorica*, **5** (1985), pp. 247–255.

[32] Q. Wu and A. E. Roth: The lattice of envy-free matchings, *Mimeo*, (2016).

[33] Y. Yokoi: A generalized polymatroid approach to stable matchings with lower quotas, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **42** (2017), pp. 238–255.